

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD

31st Meeting

Thursday, 13 May 1954

4:00 p.m.

DCI Conference Room

Administration Building

~~DOCUMENT NO. \_\_\_\_\_~~  
~~NO CHANGE IN CLASS \_\_\_\_\_~~  
~~☐ DECLASSIFIED \_\_\_\_\_~~  
~~CLASS. CHANGED TO: \_\_\_\_\_~~  
~~NEXT REVIEW DATE: \_\_\_\_\_~~  
~~AUTH: HR 70-2 \_\_\_\_\_~~  
~~DATE: JUL 81 REVIEWER: 029725~~

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD

31st Meeting

Thursday, 13 May 1954

4:00 p.m.

DCI Conference Room

Administration Building

Present

Lyman B. Kirkpatrick  
Inspector General, Chairman

Matthew Baird  
Director of Training, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]  
DC/FP, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]  
Office of the Inspector General, *Guest*

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]  
Chief of Operations, Alt. for DD/P, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]  
DAD/O, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]  
AD/Communications, Member

Harrison G. Reynolds  
AD/Personnel, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]  
C/DDP/ADMIN, Alt. for DD/P, Member *Guest*

Lawrence K. White  
ADD/A, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]  
SA/DD/I, Alt. for DD/I, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]  
Executive Secretary

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]  
Secretariat

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]  
Reporter

By Invitation:

Members of Task Force on Evaluation

[REDACTED]  
25X1A9a

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2001/03/30 : CIA-RDP80-01826R000600120003-4

~~SECRET~~



25X1A9a

\* Also Member of Task Force on Evaluation

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

. . . The 31st Meeting of the CIA Career Service Board convened at 4:00 p.m., Thursday, 13 May 1954, in the DCI Conference Room, Administration Building, with Mr. Lyman B. Kirkpatrick presiding . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, gentlemen, I think we will start right on time regardless of the absence of the DD/A, and [REDACTED] can represent him until he gets down here. We are going to have probably quite a full session this afternoon.

25X1A9a

. . . Mr. White joined the meeting . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The gentlemen surrounding you are the Task Force members that reported on the evaluation form, Fitness Report, which report was distributed to you, I think, just a few minutes prior to the meeting.

Prior to taking that up, however, can we take up the minutes of the last meeting? [REDACTED], did you have some question about them?

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I did, but [REDACTED] advised me on it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Are there any corrections or changes?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Just the CSR, Kirk, on everybody in the immediate future, which I think ought to be clarified.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Then the minutes stand approved as read. I take it the correction [REDACTED] wanted will be made?

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] That is correct.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The next item, then, is the report on the evaluation form Fitness Report, so that we don't hold up the Task Force which is with us to explain what their thoughts were on the matter. Have you all had a chance to read this report of the Task Force? Have you had an opportunity to examine the new form of the Fitness Report as submitted to you? Do you agree with it?

MR. WHITE: Kirk, I have two points here. One is I think the results of this report may be interpreted in a lot of different ways, depending upon who is reading it. I wonder if there isn't a possibility in it of the supervisor thinking he is giving a man a pretty good send-off but due to the interpretation of somebody who looks at it from an entirely different angle, may find that the impression in the Personnel Office, or the next supervisor, or somebody, may be such that he is actually giving him a pretty poor send-off. And the closest that the form comes to

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

eliminating that possibility, I think, is in Section VI, subsection A there. But I wonder if there isn't some merit either in having an adjective rating or in having a very brief description somewhere from the man who makes out the report as to just what this all adds up to to him. It can add up to a lot of different things depending on how much weight you place on various sections of it, and nowhere, except in Section VI A is there an opportunity for the man who makes out the report to say, "Well, having said all of these things, this is what it adds up to to me."

25X1A9a [REDACTED] There is a device in the military form that I think fills that need very nicely and balances it up.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Which military form?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Where it says that of all the officers you know, would you particularly like to have this guy if somebody rammed him down your throat. I think that is a very good balance.

MR. WHITE: As I understand, when we went over this before I raised the question whether we were going to try a machine run, and the answer was "No - these would rest on their own merit in the personnel files", and so forth, and it just occurred to me that depending on who adds up procedures, a man could get a low rating or a high rating which might not be consistent with what the supervisor intended him to get.

MR. BAIRD: But the reviewing officer comes in there, though, and if the supervisor is normally a low grader the reviewing officer should take care of it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I don't think we are going to accomplish the molding into a standard form of our supervisors and grading. You will always have to take into consideration the grading characteristics of the officers. Some are going to be tough, and some not.

John, in answer to your point, the United States Army form, Section V headed "Over-all Value" has eight characteristics to be checked. No. 1: An officer who is not of the caliber that one should reasonably expect in an officer. That is No. 1. And No. 8 is, "The most outstanding officer I know." And it goes right through the gradations. Is that what you mean?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] That is what I mean. It gives you a balancing factor.

MR. BAIRD: John, the trouble in our outfit is that the supervisor might be rating him as a cartographer while in the Army it's as an overall officer. Do you want that? Or do you want the supervisor to say what he

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

thinks about him as a cartographer?

25X1A9a

██████████ Couldn't you take care of that in your language?  
Naturally, in the case of a specialist you want the people rating according to their value.

25X1A9a

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, Red, do I interpret your view - which seems to be seconded by ██████████ - is that we should have a section in here somewhere with something like the Army Section - I think you put it on the basis of an adjectival rating.

MR. WHITE: That or a brief summary which kind of says, "This all adds up to me." I do mean that, Kirk. And, in answer to Matt's question, I think you want both. In the directions under Section VI A., to which I referred, it says (reading): "Consider only the skill with which the person has performed the duties of his job and rate him accordingly." In other words, he may be rated as a hot-shot geographer or cartographer, or whatever it is, but yet might not be temperamentally or emotionally suited for advancement in other fields, and so forth. What I am trying to get at - which I think leads me to say a little more than an adjective rating - is not only how has he done in this particular job--

25X1A9a

██████████ Some way of saying, "This man is a good cartographer but wouldn't be worth a hang in anything else." Or, "He is a good cartographer and would also be a good administrator."

MR. BAIRD: You don't think B. and D. help you out on that?

25X1A9a

██████████ I thought VI A. and B. get at his potentiality and suitability or fitness, and C. gives you his attitude rating.

MR. BAIRD: If you take Section VI in total, it seems to me it gets what everybody says.

25X1A9a

MR. REYNOLDS: I'd like to ask ██████████ a couple of questions. Does this lend itself, from your professional viewpoint, to a mathematical rating if we wanted to set it up?

25X1A9a

██████████: If the Board so wanted to set it up, it does lend itself to that type of study.

MR. REYNOLDS: Now does this enable the Office of Personnel to carry out its basic function of promotion, assignment, reassignment, and separation, through evaluation of this report?

25X1A9a

██████████ It enables you to carry out that part of the personnel function where you want to get an evaluation of the individual.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

That is, when you are interested in knowing where he stands in relation to his job or in relation to other and similar jobs - it would help you in those functions. It is not designed to facilitate the relationship of the supervisor and the employee.

MR. REYNOLDS: Can an ordinary placement clerk or records and processing clerk carry through that evaluation for the purpose of translating it into a mathematical figure to go on a machine run, say, or does it have to be done by an expert who thoroughly understands the form?

25X1A9a

██████████ Once the basic studies are made by which you arrive at any mathematical score that you might use as a supplement to what you read in the form, then any placement officer can use it and carry it out, and use it in ways which would be determined by policy.

MR. BAIRD: Do I understand your question, though, to mean this could be used competitively?

MR. REYNOLDS: Not necessarily, Matt. No, I think we must have a final result of this form which will enable us to carry out those basic functions.

MR. BAIRD: I wondered whether you meant you could weigh two people on a scale basis.

MR. REYNOLDS: In this business of "zone of consideration" you might want to use it that way. But I want to be sure we have something here that we can use in that manner if we find we have to.

25X1A9a

██████████ You mean you want to be able to add up your "X's"?

MR. REYNOLDS: More this back part here. I'm not sure of the mechanics of it myself but I think we should look to something of that kind. I chatted with General Cabell about it this morning and he feels we have to come to some mathematical system with the Agency the size that it is. He doesn't particularly like a mathematical rating system but he feels that of necessity we are going to have to adopt one.

MR. BAIRD: Like the point score of the Air Force.

MR. REYNOLDS: Something like that.

25X1A9a

██████████ If I might add a comment, it again depends on the purpose for which it is being used. If you are faced with the task of locating a small number of relatively able people in an Agency of this size and you want to give everybody an equal chance to be included in that group, it becomes an impossible task to go through the thousands of

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

forms that you have. But if through a quantitative score you could pick out say those that scored, or you could pick out twice or three or four times as many as you finally wanted to get, then you would be fairly sure that you would include a sufficient number who were really capable, so that by the inspection then of the other records available, and by applying just ordinary logic to the interpretation of the questions on this blank, you would then really have a better chance of getting the ones you wanted. Otherwise you would have to have a task force half the size of the Agency to keep up with the records. A quantitative score is practically a necessity when you get large enough. But it should never be a sole reliance. It is somewhat like a screening device: You pick out 50 people and you say, "Now I have time to study these 50 people well to pick out the 5 or 10 or 15 that I really want."

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What is the view of the Board on this form? Is it acceptable in its present form or are additional modifications desired?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I'd like to make a comment. I'd like the mandatory provision that it must not be shown to the individual being rated.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] How about it being made optional?

[REDACTED] I'd like very much to have it made optional.

MR. WHITE: Well, it occurred to me that either you show the fellow the whole thing or you don't show him any part of it. You have to do one or the other. If you show only one side of it and you say, "I'm going to discuss this with you but I am not going to show you what I write down" -- I'm sure all of us who looked at efficiency reports in the Pentagon and think back ten or fifteen years, say, "Well, that old so-and-so. He told me he was giving me good efficiency reports and this is what I got." The same thing would happen here. It's a human tendency not to make it quite as clear when telling the fellow, or else he misinterprets it as he chooses, until some day he finds out exactly what you put on there. Either show him the whole thing or nothing.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] That is exactly what I mean. I never put in a report on an individual unless I can give it to him and tell him to study it and come back and talk with me about it. I would like to have that right, whether anybody else does or not.

MR. REYNOLDS: I prefer it optional.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think it should be optional.

~~SECRET~~



~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I don't think anybody has any right to make a derogatory comment about a guy if he doesn't have the nerve to tell him so.

MR. WHITE: Well, this would take care of that - there is attached a copy of the memorandum notifying him of unsatisfactory performance.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] That takes care of it; and if you make the thing at the top an "optional" statement, that would handle it.

MR. BAIRD: You're not going to be consistent within the branch or office?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] It may not be. Here is the point that bothers me, and I think others, too, that it is all very well to talk about this thing in the context of Washington, but if you have a Field Station of 3 people and a fellow just plain isn't doing his job but he has six months to go, and he's in the depths of Indo-China and there isn't anybody to replace him - souring that guy to the point of getting no performance out of him, simply in the interest of a principle, doesn't make sense. But you don't want to send a report into Washington saying that he is the "Queen of the May", so that he goes on to some other station. So if you make it optional you have the opportunity not to show it to anybody in this Station if you don't want to.

MR. BAIRD: I feel, in view of what I have read here, that the Task Force, who spent a hell of a lot more time on it than we have, are split on some issues but they certainly aren't split on this one. They certainly must have good reasons to have a unanimous opinion on it.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] That is a misnotation, because the representative on this was not informed of this.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] voted with this.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] That is not what he told me.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Then he is telling two different stories. There was no question about it. I have the vote sheet right here. [REDACTED] voted with the Task Force.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, quite frankly I think perhaps the not wholly unanimous opinion but certainly the preponderant opinion of the CIA Career Service Board is to make it optional, and while I trust this will not offend the feelings of the Task Force, I'd be happy to put it to a vote.

MR. BAIRD: Before we make a firm decision on this I'd like to

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

ask the Chairman of the Task Force to explain why he feels - and I'm reading now, I haven't discussed this with anybody - why "The Task Force wishes to go on record that it is unanimous in its opinion that the form as proposed should not be shown to the individual." Before we make this decision I would like to hear what the Task Force says, because they spent a lot more time on it than we have and they are probably just as able to make a decision as we are.

25X1A9a MR. KIRKPATRICK: [REDACTED] would you care to report on it?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] doesn't mind, since I consider him the expert on evaluative techniques in the Agency, I would like to, if you want to call it that, "pass the buck" to him as to why this should not be shown to the individual.

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: In noting your various summaries of my own comments, [REDACTED] I think you interpret my point of view better than I do myself. But briefly, the issue on not showing a report comes down to the fact that when reports are not shown evaluations are simply more lenient. That is the basic point. The second basic point, by showing the report to the individual you have gained nothing because it was not devised in the analytical way that the PER was, so that if there was a change of opinion there was an opportunity to do something with the individual on improving him. My own philosophy is that the function of evaluation and of supervision for improvement of an individual should be separated. We get into a whole lot of trouble because we try to combine them all the time. I would venture the guess that if you adopt the policy of showing them at the option of the supervisor, you will have that part of the Agency that shows them coming in with reports that will mean something else from those who do not show them.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] What you are saying, in effect, is that I can't make an objective report and show it to the individual.

25X1A [REDACTED] I am saying, sir, on the average that would happen.

25X1A [REDACTED] What principle do you have here? I have a paper here that says the State Department Foreign Service and for all Service personnel the matter of showing the report is optional; and, in fact, in the case of Service personnel it is required.

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: It is only required by the Marines at the present time.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a [REDACTED] It has always been optional.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, it is my view, Ed, based on experience, now, on the cases coming to me, that we are not going to gain much by not toughening up the supervisors who haven't got the strength of character to tell their personnel that they are giving them a poor rating. We aren't going to gain much because the individuals who are badly rated then, and find out about it later or find themselves out of a job - that's going to create more personnel problems than it will solve.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] The problem is not that. The problem is whether you can get a real evaluation from the supervisor in terms of doing it at the same time. Now I did not say and I don't think I have ever implied that the supervisor's job is not to tell the individual where he stands. I believe very strongly that he should, and I believe very strongly, as this certification says, that he should tell it in terms that are roughly consistent with what he says on this report. I think we believe that you get into more difficulty than you avoid when you insist on his seeing this particular one.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] There is no insistence there. It's a matter of letting each one of us go our own way on it.

MR. BAIRD: What has been the experience of the PER? Do you feel the PER is better for its having been shown?

MR. WHITE: My experience has been that everytime I said anything unkind about anybody I had a 16-hour session on my hands! But I believe that that is the way to do it. I have never made out a PER yet that I didn't hand to an individual and say, "Here it is. Read it, and if you think I've made any mistakes tell me where they are." And I have had few people tell me I've made a mistake. I still think that is the way to do it, because then there is no question and they know exactly where they stand with me.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I think the vilest thing that comes about is when you rate a guy badly and don't let him know about it.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] You can damn a man with faint praise over a long period, too.

MR. WHITE: But you can still say he is not quite satisfactory--

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Once again, I feel the majority view of the Board is to make it optional as to whether it should be shown. Would you

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

like to have it voted on, Matt?

MR. BAIRD: No, but I would like to ask the Task Force whether they now feel, knowing it should be shown, whether they think it is the best fitness report in view of the fact that it can be shown. I don't want [REDACTED] to do all of the talking. In fact, I wish he wouldn't talk at all. He belongs to the Office of Training. Apparently this is a unanimous statement here.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We aren't forcing [REDACTED] to talk.

MR. BAIRD: I am just asking for information, Kirk, because I feel strongly if we are going to ask these task forces to do what is really our work, that we don't lightly brush off their unanimous recommendations.

MR. WHITE: Could I ask a related question - which is thinking ahead a little bit, I hope: What means are we going to provide to allow the employee to see what his evaluations have added up to over a period of three or four years? In the Service - at least you could when I was in the Service - you could go over to the Pentagon and they would show them to you.

MR. [REDACTED] In fact, they encouraged you to come and do it.

MR. WHITE: I know they did and I got there once in 14 years. Maybe that was good - I didn't find out what some people thought about me until I was out of the Service.

[REDACTED] They do on other things, too, or used to. They put out what they called a "GER", a general efficiency rating average over a period, for everyone with five years or more service, and they are permitted to know what their GER is.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Maybe we could get down to brass tacks if I read to you some excerpts from the four Service reports. The Marine report is typically Marine. (Reading) "I have seen this completed report." "I have no statement to make" - and there's a box there; or, "I have attached a statement" - with a box there. "Signature of officer reported on."

The Navy report, Section 14 (reading): "A report containing adverse matter must be referred to the officer reported on for statement pursuant to Article 1701 (8), USNR. His statement should be attached to this report. Statements of minor deficiencies either in character or performance of duties must be brought to the attention of the officer reported on either orally or in writing. Has this been done? What improvement, if

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

any, has been noted?" And there's a space for indication.

The United States Air Force - I don't notice any place here. Is there a place, do you know?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] There was, but I'm not sure of this new form.

MR. BAIRD: I've never seen one in the 30 months I was on active duty in this Agency. Maybe I should have.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: And there is no place on the Army form to indicate that.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] The Task Force devised its certification from the statement used by the Navy, namely, that any adverse statement or statement of a minor deficiency in character or performance of duty would be brought to his attention - but not through the medium of showing the report.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] It does require, in the case of an adverse comment, that you give him the whole report, doesn't it?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] It doesn't say anything about that.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: There is nothing on either the Army or Air Force report. Does any other member of the Task Force have any views on this as to whether it should or should not be shown to the individual reported on?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Bob Amory had one comment on format. In the interest of simplicity, in Section IV under categories, he didn't see the need for the three-way breakdown under each of the major headings. It used to be five and now it's down to three. He would like to suggest one box.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] To turn it into a numerical--  
[REDACTED] I don't know what that does to the internal working of the form.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Leaving it the way it is will facilitate the kind of thing Mr. Reynolds might like to do with it. In light of experience for training evaluations, no matter how many boxes we give the instructor he still wants to slide. If we cut down then he wants to put it in the middle. I see no harm in it, in any event, because there is no pretense that those distinctions are very great.

MR. BAIRD: John, wouldn't what Section III says - the rater signs for this in Section III, what he certifies to --

25X1A9a [REDACTED] That is satisfactory.

MR. BAIRD: I was trying to answer your position. You could be

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

up for perjury if you did that, because here you certify that you let him know what you thought of him, and you certify to that by signing your name here.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I would still like to make this other business permissible, because you can give a guy a satisfactory rating but it is not a very good rating. So I would like to show these things to people.

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: We have always shown the PER's.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Matt, I believe there is something in the Regulation - is there not, Harry? - that if a PER is unsatisfactory it is required that it be shown to the employee?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Not the PER, only the memorandum which is attached, that is, item 17 of the PER. There is nothing in the Regulation that requires the PER be shown, because we had exactly this same discussion two years ago when there was a question of whether we should or should not show it.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] You sign a statement.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] No, it's just discussed.

[REDACTED]: Could I make one suggestion? This is personal opinion but I think it probably does represent at least some opinion among the other members of this Task Force. It is a fact that this form, particularly Section IV of it, was not designed with any thought that it would be shown to the person concerned, and I think because of that it may be that there are some statements included in that Section which may cause more trouble than they will good, by leaving them there, if the reports are to be shown. I think of the statement, "gets along with people at all social levels", for example. I don't know whether enabling a supervisor and an employee to sit down together, if this form is used, and discuss a supervisor's opinion of someone's ability to get along with people - not necessarily in the sense of his job, because that isn't the way this was necessarily intended - at all social levels, whether that really is going to add anything. I can think of some people that I have supervised where that would cause a very difficult morale problem if I were to say that I thought they did or did not in some degree measure up to some vague standard of getting along with other folks.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] If it's going to affect his career you should be willing to state it.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] But I wonder if I am in a position to say whether

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

he does or does not.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I'd like to say something about that, Mr.

Chairman. I have had many years' experience in making out fitness reports, and I like this degree thing - because on the Personnel Evaluation Report there is just one place where you can say something not too good about an individual, and it's qualitative and they will come in and say, "I don't agree with you." But here if you state they did not get along with people, invariably you say, "This is my opinion" - and they can't do anything more about it, and they go away and say, "Maybe I better see what I can do about that."

MR. BAIRD: There is one thing you can't tell a guy and live with him afterwards and that is that he does not have a sense of humor.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We are really trying to ride all four fans of the windmill at once, for the simple reason that if anybody is going to be argumentative about a fitness report they have 50 points to be argumentative about. So they will be arguing on 50 points if you will let them, and they will argue just as much whether it's one point or 50, so I don't see what the purpose is there. But as I understand it now it is still the view, and to make sure there is no disagreement on this will all those in favor of making it optional kindly raise their hands? Now, mandatory.

MR. WHITE: If unsatisfactory.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, I think that carries it.

The second point that is under consideration is whether the form should be further modified to have a more specific indication of the general caliber of the individual, along the lines as quoted from the Army form, or if, to be a little more concise, the Air Force form that has the overall evaluation - five boxes: unsatisfactory, an acceptable officer, a dependable and typically effective officer, a very fine officer of great value to the Service, and finally, one of the very few outstanding officers I know.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Yes.

[REDACTED]: It's here in one place or another.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any further discussion of the form?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I notice a difference between this alternate form and the one we were discussing, particularly in having the individual state his preference for station and job.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a [REDACTED] May I speak to that? I think my people put it up.  
May I suggest that that particular item doesn't very well fit with the  
fitness report concept because it has to come in at specific times for  
specific assignment and consideration purposes that don't fit in.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I wondered why it came in, because I have this  
on my home leave and reassignment request.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I don't believe it has any place in the fitness report.  
MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any further discussion of this form? Is it  
acceptable to the Board? Any opposition to it? I move that the Board  
accept the form as submitted and that it be put into effect at the earliest  
possible date. Secondly, I move that the Board tender its thanks to the  
Task Force for the great degree of labor they have put into this job.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] In view of the fact that this is going to be shown,  
Kirk, will you permit the Task Force to take a hard look to see if there is  
anything that must be changed - any of the wording? Or what wording do you  
want here? In other words, what do you want to say there? Somebody has to  
say it.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] May be shown.  
[REDACTED] It's optional whether or not this fitness form will  
be shown to the individual being rated.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Is this report now Agency-wide and effective  
overseas at the same time it becomes effective here?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] When it has been sterilized.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: How much sterilization?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] That is going to take about a week's hard work to  
sterilize it.

25X1A

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Will the certification need to be changed, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]: No, we will leave the certification stand the  
way it is. Isn't that correct?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes.

Thank you very much, gentlemen. We appreciate your sitting in  
today.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I think I speak for the Task Force when I say:  
Gentlemen, your problems are just beginning.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Thank you for that happy note. (Laughter)



~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a



MR. KIRKPATRICK: All right, gentlemen, you have had your one minute of relaxation.

Item 2 is the Career Development of Junior Personnel - the revised Staff Study, submitted for approval. Are there any comments on this?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I'd like to comment on 4.a.(2). Again, I may have thoroughly misunderstood, but I thought that--

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] In the plan? Not the Regulation?

[REDACTED] In the Regulation itself, on page 2 of proposed

25X1A

Notice [REDACTED] We still have in here that any staff employee may apply. Again I wish to state that I think we are going to be flooded with a mass of applications that is going to create an unnecessary administrative load and complicate the problem terrifically.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] And probably those applications are going to come from just exactly the wrong--

MR. BAIRD: Well, if they do will they get consideration?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] They will have to be forwarded and screened by the Board. None of them may be held up, even those that are acted on unfavorably, according to this Notice they will still have to go to the screening board.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] The least we can do is to state that there are "X" number of applications.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Everybody and his brother is going to apply. But they won't be as disappointed if you say a limited number will be accepted.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, let's have a vote on it. We went around this circle at the last meeting. How many favor allowing applications - raise their hands. Four voted. Now how many favor not allowing applications? Three. And [REDACTED] All right, with General

25X1A9a

25X1A

[REDACTED] vote that's five to three. Did the three want to make a strong fight of it?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I don't think it's going to wreck the Agency.

[REDACTED] I don't think it's going to wreck the Agency, but

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

would one of the five voting in favor of it speak to the point as to why it is desirable?

MR. WHITE: Sure, I will. First of all, I think that our fears may be largely theoretical instead of practical. I think even though you have a mass of applications, there will be an initial flood and then it will all be over, and I think we can stand that. It will mean some extra work but I think we can stand that. And we will do less damage over all than if we were to allow the impression to be gained by people on the lower levels that, "I can't get through. My supervisor doesn't like me." Or, "I have a personality conflict with him. Or, "It was something I did last year and he just won't forward my application." It seems to me we would rather lean over backwards than to allow that sort of a feeling to develop. And also, I think it would increase Kirk's business.

MR. REYNOLDS: I think it is a true career concept to leave it in as it is; and secondly, I would say if it becomes so difficult to handle that we cannot handle it, we will have to amend that particular paragraph.

MR. BAIRD: Or make the requirements more stringent.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I think we ought to have some statement about the stringent requirements involved. If you point out that only a limited few will be accepted you won't have as many disappointed people.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I think we should state that it is not the only way of getting along in the Agency.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Dick, while I didn't vote on the particular proposal, my inclination would be if we are going to issue a Notice on the subject and distribute it to all employees, it would cause a very difficult morale problem to say that applications are not entertained. If you just ignore the subject and do not put in any word about the applications, you are going to get applications from the same people that you would if you have this paragraph in. And I feel that if we want to have as impartial and as broad a career service as possible, that we should at least assume the bureaucratic and administrative costs inherent in telling unsatisfactory people that they are not qualified for this, rather than by simply trying to cut it off by an administrative device of not allowing applications. If it is handled properly there will be an initial flood of applicants, never again to be seen, because it's only

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

your incoming people that will get into this and apply for it. And I piously hope that under our new system of screening people coming in, and the Junior Officer Trainee Program, that there will be just a bare handful inclined after the initial flood.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I don't want to press the thing any further.

[REDACTED] There is one more point in connection with that, that is worthy of consideration. 4.a.(4) here says, (Reading): "Accompanying the application will be a Career Development Plan worked out by the individual and his supervisor and commented upon by the office of current assignment where appropriate and by the Head of the individual's Career Service." Presuming the supervisor says, "I don't think this guy is worthy of a Career Development Plan" - is he forced to sit down with this man before he sends forward the application, and work out a career development plan even though he doesn't think the individual is capable? The way this is worded he must forward the application with a Career Development Plan regardless of his personal reaction.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I take a dim view of the next sentence, that

no prior coordination is needed with the office he is going to go to.

MR. BAIRD: We don't know what office he is going to.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] (Reading): "This plan does not need prior

concurrence of those offices in which it is expected the individual will be detailed during his development cycle...."

MR. BAIRD: The Selection Committee is the one that determines that. If the Selection Committee approves the plan--to answer Ted's point--why not? Where is it, Ted?

25X1A

[REDACTED] In the first sentence at the top of 3, Matt.

MR. BAIRD: I'd say, "....may, at the discretion of the supervisor...." The Selection Panel or people working out the program may change it anyhow.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] They have to have some kind of a plan.

MR. BAIRD: Let them do it. The plan that the individual works out is a very good basis on which to judge whether the man really deserves a career development.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Couldn't we say, "his supervisor, where appropriate"?

MR. WHITE: As a practical matter, this is not going to select a man the Board doesn't recommend. It will be rare. And if in an extreme

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

case they feel that the Career Service Board head, or whoever it is -- they would certainly go back and say, "Don't you think we should reconsider this?" So why couldn't we change this to say, "when the supervisor recommends that he be taken in, such a plan be worked out."

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Or you might say, "accompanying the application, if approved by the supervisor."

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think that would be acceptable to everybody.

MR. REYNOLDS: Yes, that is all right.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Is this going to be applicable in the field?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I think it must be.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think it has to be.

MR. BAIRD: On completion of a normal tour of duty.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] But can a man in the field apply when this is distributed?

MR. BAIRD: He can't be selected until he comes back and appears before the Selection Board, but he would be eligible upon return from his normal tour of duty overseas.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] (Reading) "Evaluation of data in applicant's official personnel folder, which must contain a current PER." He won't get a PER for a year, or for some part of a year. If that means a new form, then it's all right.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] It meant whatever PER was due.  
[REDACTED] But we don't have any PER's on the field people. If you put this thing out on the basis that only people in headquarters can apply for this, you're asking for trouble.

MR. BAIRD: Oh, God, no. There is no intention of doing that, Ted.

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: Why not say "current" evaluation?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Make it a "current" evaluation and then you aren't tied down to any form.

Are there any other comments on either the Staff Study or the suggested Notice?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Is there anything in the plan or the Notice that says what the Staff Study says at the top of page 2, (Reading): "Participation in the program would represent no assurance to the individual of eventual advancement, or assignment to any particular position"? Does

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

that appear anywhere in the Regulation? If not, it should - or in the Notice.

MR. BAIRD: I think that is a good thing to bring in; and also Joe's point.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] That ought to go in.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What was your point?

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: Point out the very limited number of positions.  
It's a Notice.

MR. BAIRD: If it's a Notice you can be more discursive, can't you?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] That is right.

You can get awfully discursive in a Regulation.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What is your recommendation, Matt? That

25X1A9a [REDACTED] point be included in the Notice?

MR. BAIRD: Yes.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: And what was the other point?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] And point out the very limited number of positions -  
because you are going to be turning down a lot of highly qualified people.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think both points should go in there.

Incidentally, on page 4 of your Staff Study, would you change paragraph e. to read "As of December 31, 1953"? You're working too fast for me.

Any other comments or corrections? Does the Board wish to have this Notice come back to it after these corrections are made? All right, then we recommend it be issued after revisions as indicated.

The next item on the agenda I would like to pass over for the moment.

The next item is the Career Development Position Status Report. Is there any comment on that? That is purely for information.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I have one Career Development Slot request ready to come before the Board.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: All staffed out? And the Director of Training agrees?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] He is proposing it.

MR. BAIRD: I concur in them all.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] This is the case of [REDACTED] a Training 25X1A9a  
Instructor in the Training Division at [REDACTED] Grade GS-9; 28 years old; 25X1A6a

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

he has been with the Agency since 16 May 1952 - two years; he's a training instructor in paramilitary - in jump techniques.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Didn't you lose a guy yesterday?

MR. BAIRD: You mean he was killed?

25X1A9a MR. REYNOLDS: [REDACTED] was killed yesterday.

MR. BAIRD: He's not my man. Where was he killed?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] [REDACTED] His chute didn't open. Maybe he belongs to SR Division, to their training establishment. But he was down there to get his jump status up.

25X1A6a

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But he isn't a training man.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I'm sorry, Matt, I thought he belonged to you.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: All right.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] has taught most of the subjects given in the Air Branch but is most recognized as an expert in air packing. He received a Superior Accomplishment Award for his developments in that field. His career plan calls for an overseas assignment with SE Division, following which he will return as a Senior Instructor. This plan has been coordinated with SE Division who are providing the overseas slot for this man.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Is that all there is to it? He's going overseas with SE Division?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] That is right.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Is there any objection?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] (Reading): "It is a two-year overseas assignment in SE Division and will permit him to obtain operational experience in those subjects he has been teaching. He will have an opportunity to test and further refine techniques and devices which he has developed."

25X1A9a [REDACTED] It makes so much sense I don't know why it would come before this Board.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Well, the SE Division apparently has no slot to use him on and we are providing a Career Development Slot which, in effect, gives SE another body.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Do you have any objection, Mr. [REDACTED]

25X1A9a

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I think it is an excellent suggestion.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any objection on the part of the Board?

All right.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Is there any new business you have to bring up,

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Or anybody else? Because I want to go back to item 3. Alright, Item 3 is "The Career Service of the Central Intelligence Agency", the final draft of the proposed Regulation.

You will recall that last week Mr. Reynolds said that he had several misgivings about this report, and voiced these misgivings. You will also recall that I pointed out that these particular misgivings - that is, the difficulty of "second-class citizens" as apart from the career service, had also been discussed over a considerable period of time. After the meeting, at one of the Director's staff meetings, I advised the Director that this Regulation had been agreed upon by the Board and would be coming to him for approval inasmuch as it was a highly controversial measure and a policy measure which should not be implemented without the fullest consideration. The Director asked whether this was a unanimous opinion. I stated that the Board was in agreement on it but that there had been considerable disagreement along the line from various components of the Agency, but I thought it had been fairly well ironed out. I also suggested that the Director might like to attend a meeting of the Career Service Board so that it could discuss this specific Regulation with him. Mr. Reynolds advises me today that he has discussed the matter with General Cabell, and that he feels there are so many bugs still in the Regulation that it would be unwise to implement it at the present time; and further suggests that the contemplated dissolution of the Career Service Board and the transition to a Personnel/Career Board, as has been discussed, should take place at the earliest possible date.

Before turning the discussion over to Mr. Reynolds to make his views known, I would like to state my views on this subject, even at the possible risk of some reiteration. As Inspector General in my report on the Personnel Office, and I believe I've told you all this before, I pointed out that I thought the present system did tend to dissipate the authority of the Personnel Office, and that at an early date the Assistant Director for Personnel should become the Chairman of the CIA Career Service Board. At the time that Mr. Reynolds took over as Assistant Director for Personnel, a meeting was held to discuss various problems concerning the Personnel Office and Career Service - at which meeting I was not present - at which time it was discussed as to

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

whether Mr. Reynolds should take over the CIA Career Service Board simultaneously with becoming Assistant Director for Personnel. At the risk of making myself unpleasant, when this particular regulation was presented to me I declined to concur in it, and at that particular juncture the Director went along. I pointed out that certain items were in progress on the CIA Career Service Board for which I was willing to assume responsibility and take a minor share of credit for having started these items, and that I would like to finish them out. Shortly before General Cabell went on his trip, Mr. Reynolds and I discussed the identical situation with the Deputy Director, and decided that the ideal time for this transition would be simultaneously with the implementation of the career service program, and the general transition of this Board fading out of existence and a new board being established.

Harry now feels quite strongly that this transition should take place immediately, and I gather he also feels that the regulation on career service should not be implemented as of July 1st, there being too many bugs in it, and consequently feels that the entire transition should take place forthwith.

As far as I am concerned I do not wish any further to be a party to what seems to be impeding the progress of career service, and herewith submit my resignation as Chairman of the CIA Career Service Board. And secondly, I make a recommendation that this Board dissolve itself and turn the entire matter over to the Assistant Director for Personnel.

Mr. Reynolds, the floor is yours.

MR. REYNOLDS: The main factor in my reaching this decision was that we spend 100 percent of our time on personnel business; and I feel that we can do more to further the career service program and put it on firm ground because we are in the business 100 percent of the time. I would propose, therefore, that we take this regulation in the Office of Personnel - which is the basic regulation - and implement it in pieces so that the very points which were brought up by Ted this morning at Red's meeting, that the overseas people thought this thing was just a snare and a delusion, can be submitted to them in a form which really means benefits and definite progress.

Now we have performed two definite acts which I think are true career service: one is the overall promotion policy and the other one is this JOT - Junior Officer Trainee Program. We have to get the insurance thing so that it can be presented to the Agency as an accomplished fact and that it is a benefit. We have to settle a number of other questions which we bring up

~~SECRET~~



~~SECRET~~

in here so that when we present this to the rank and file of the Agency we really have the career service that we can answer every question on, and not be embarrassed by trying to gloss over something we can't answer, which we couldn't do if we went through with the program which we outlined in trying to make this up into a package to deliver on July 1st. Now I am completely sure that a career service program in this Agency should be in it, and should be Agency-wide, and that it should be exactly along the lines for a sound personnel program, and that is why I think that this integration should take place at once.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I'd like to make one statement here, to make sure my remarks this morning at the DD/A meeting were taken in proper context. I said there, as I have said many times since coming back from the Far East trip, that the bad reaction we get in the field is because we never put anything on career service in the field - because we haven't put out this kind of career service policy and not because we wait for the insurance program, and what have you. We need to get SOMETHING of this program out into the field - the same kind of thing we have in headquarters already. So what I had to say this morning I think has no bearing on what Mr. Reynolds said.

MR. REYNOLDS: I realize that and I don't want your statement this morning misconstrued by this Board here. It impressed me, Ted, with great emphasis, that we have got to get something to the field - to the point of where I told General Cabell and told Kirk that I would, myself - just as soon as we had this thing jelled to a point where we could properly present it - that I would go one way overseas and somebody else the other way overseas, and personally tell this to the major components, if that is the way to do it.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Based again on what I said this morning, I still don't understand why we get so much around headquarters and never anything out to the field advising people.

MR. REYNOLDS: Then I think we should work very, very closely with you, starting at once, to see that something gets out to the field in writing anyway.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] What?

MR. REYNOLDS: I'm not sure. I don't know "what". That is one of the reasons that I did not feel we could deliver this neat package to the Agency as a whole on the 1st of July. And I think we have a lot more work to do in our Office, which is concerned 100 percent.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a [REDACTED] You mean redraft the thing?

MR. REYNOLDS: I think it has to be a series of things, and we have to do them very promptly. I think one of the most important things, and

25X1A9a I am impressed by [REDACTED] statements on that, is to get this insurance business, which is a very favorable and an excellent proposition for the Agency as a whole - it's better than anything else anywhere else in Government - to get that out and get it to these people and say, "This is the principal element - the first element we are delivering - of career service."

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: Isn't the insurance program going to apply to everybody?

MR. REYNOLDS: But I look upon the career service of CIA as the whole Agency. And as we go on those who do not get into those things will be those people who refuse to go overseas by reason of whimsy or who are not true career employees.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I am puzzled by something. Either it hasn't been said or I am a little dense. Is the nuts and bolts of this the fact that the Deputy Director is dissatisfied with the work the Career Service Board has done on this program? Or just what is the issue?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I'm afraid I couldn't answer that. I haven't discussed the matter with the Deputy Director.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Speaking just as one individual around here, I've been working on this thing for 3 years now. I totaled that up yesterday. Which means I put a hell of a lot of the Agency's time into it. And if the work of the various task forces and the various studies that have been made on this thing, by the best people we could find to do it, isn't satisfactory, then I think it would be only fair to tell us.

MR. REYNOLDS: That is not true, Dick. The Deputy Director's feeling in this thing is exactly the same as my own, that it is part of the personnel program in this Agency, and for that reason it should be integrated at once. I don't for one moment propose to alter one single thing that has been done for the good of the Agency. Furthermore, the Board as constituted will be this same board, and I would call upon this Board for concurrence and assistance in anything to do with this, because we have got to do it that way.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Will it be the same Board, though?

MR. REYNOLDS: Well, virtually the same. It's in the April 1

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

minutes that we had here. I didn't bring that with me - but it's the same. It's the six components of the Agency represented on it, with the amendment of 8 April which says the AD/P is the Chairman.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I think career service, Harry, is certainly tied up with personnel problems, and it is of more interest, naturally, and more your job than anybody else's, but it affects everybody in this Agency, and it's vital in our operations and everything else.

MR. REYNOLDS: Doesn't everything that the Personnel Office performs affect the whole Agency vitally? We wouldn't be worth a damn if we didn't think of the Agency as a whole, and the welfare of the people in it. We are concerned with people. Where does my basic charter as the AD/P differ from the basic concept of career service? Where?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Will the Personnel Office re-do this and implement it from there on, or what?

MR. REYNOLDS: It will be implemented with the concurrence of the six major components who sit around this table now. You heard me last week - a week ago tonight - and I felt that some of those pitfalls have got to be either completely dissolved as being just a dream or figment of my imagination, or they have got to be solved in some way so that they are realistic to the people of CIA.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think that is perfectly true, Harry, but where I fall away from you on that particular issue is: What has happened then to the work, the discussions, the debates and the deliberations on these very same and identical pitfalls, that has gone on in the past? Is all of that just lost again?

MR. REYNOLDS: Certainly not. It all has a very strong bearing on this thing, and the one thing - when I told the Deputy Director this morning Dick had said he felt this was a question on which the Director should sit down and go over the whole thing, he said, "I am completely consonant with that." And that was the thing that more than anything else aggravated my wish to start this thing and implement it at once.

MR. WHITE: May I say something, Kirk? I believe we have two problems here. The first is the timing in transferring these functions to the Personnel Office. My understanding of this whole business - and just to clarify a point, the meeting to which you referred was not called to discuss career service in any way. It did come into the meeting. But I

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

think the Board should know the meeting which Kirk referred to was merely called for the purpose of stripping me down to size and putting Harry in business, and so forth - that when the Personnel Office went from the DD/A to the immediate jurisdiction of the Director, the career service did come in. With that one exception I think the facts are just about as Kirk related them. But however that may be, we have agreed at this table, and not too long ago, that that transfer should take place, and it's a question of WHEN it should take place.

Now it seems to me, as far as I am concerned, that that is a matter between you and Harry Reynolds and the Director. I personally don't care who carries the Career Service Board between now and the 30th of June. I think that is something which could best be decided by a conference between you and Mr. Reynolds and General Cabell. I am sure the rest of us would be more than happy to take what came out of that meeting. I'd like to recommend that that be done.

Now the other problem, and I think it's a different problem, is what you do about this proposed career service package. Now as you quite properly say, these things have all been fought around this table now for many months, and I for one, as we have gone along, have expressed my concern about some of these things. I think we all have. I don't believe anybody else does think that this is an ideal package, because the facts are that legally we don't have very much to offer. We are asking a lot from the employee without being able to say, "In return for that, you get this." And the one thing which I hated to see in here, frankly, was on page 3 where it says "tenure". That is one of our weak points, is that we say in effect that if there is a reduction-in-force people in the career service will receive preferential treatment - but legally we can't live up to that.

But my own feeling is - with all misgivings as to the pitfalls, and I think there are many of them there - I think it is a question of whether we go into this thing with our eyes open or not. I think there are many risks which are "calculated risks", if you want to put it that way, in this program. And I think it is awfully important that when this is presented to the Director it is presented to him in that way, so that he understands - as I understand it, at least - that we recognize that this is not a perfect package, and that there are a lot of pitfalls in it, but even though it is controversial it is the best thing that we have been able to

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

agree upon around this table. And then I think it is up to him to decide whether he wants to put this thing out as a package or piecemeal, or just how.

I really think that these are two separate points, and that they can both be settled much better at a conference between you and Harry or General Cabell and the Director, than they can here. I would personally like to recommend that course be followed.

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: Could I say something as a layman and non-voting member of this Board? You have been kind enough to invite me here a number of times on these things. I am under the impression that the most competent senior administrative machinery has been applied to this thing for a long time. I can't see, for the life of me, how a further going back and going over it by the Personnel Office is going to emerge with a better plan than that which, after many months of soul searching has been arrived at by these senior people in the Agency who are going to have to live with it and suffer with it.

MR. REYNOLDS: No such thing is contemplated. I have no thought of scrapping anything that has been done. I simply want to be absolutely sure that we are as near right as we can be. My only reason for doing it is that at the moment we are operating two personnel programs, and I don't think we should. I don't think it is for the good of the people in this Agency as a whole, to do that, because this is a committee which virtually tells me what to do along the line of career service, which is nothing more or less than a sound personnel program. It's just as if you had a committee who told you how to operate in the North Asia Command. It really is, Ted.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] No, it's quite different. I submit, Harry, that that is not faintly analogous.

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: Who has a more vital interest in personnel policy than the operational people who have to use it?

MR. REYNOLDS: That is right, and is there any reason, Ted, that you should think I would scrap the best brains of this Agency and try to do something new when this is the only way it can be done? All I wanted to do - because we are concerned with this thing day in and day out - is to put out this Regulation in as clear a form as it can be in. We may have to omit some things that we can't back up - like tenure, but to get it out as promptly as possible and then submit it to you in final form. Because we have

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

professionals over there who know a lot about some of those things, and I think it can be done very much more expeditiously than it can be done by this committee.

MR. WHITE: I may put what I said in the form of a motion. I might preface it by saying I don't think there is much more - before this paper - to be accomplished. I would like to make a motion.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I have two motions before the Board, so if you are submitting another one it should be a modification. Motion No. 1 is that my resignation as Chairman of the CIA Career Service Board be accepted forthwith; and Motion No. 2 is that this Board dissolve itself forthwith.

MR. WHITE: I would like to modify your first motion, then, in this way - to say that you have pioneered this program, and that Mr. Reynolds, who is going to share the burden of implementing it, seek a conference with the Deputy Director and/or the Director, and decide as to whether you shall continue as the Chairman of this Board or whether Mr. Reynolds shall succeed you, at what time, and so forth.

MR. BAIRD: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to second both of your motions and speak on them.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Which motions are you seconding?

MR. BAIRD: Yours. I addressed my statement to you. I have been at this longer than I think anybody here--

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think you and Dick and I will have to stand together on that, with the qualification that I was out for 8 months.

MR. BAIRD: No, I will say this - that was one of the reasons General Smith asked me to come into the Agency in the first place. From January 3 to July 3, 1951, one of the things the Office of Training did was to put out a proposal for a career service program in CIA. It was given to the Director on July 3, 1951. One of the recommendations in that proposal was that this proposal now be turned over to the AD for Personnel for implementation. The Director acted upon that career service proposal by establishing a Career Service Board and appointing the Assistant Director for Personnel as Chairman. I think one of the reasons that all of that back history was done was because the then Director did not feel that the Personnel Office as constituted in 1950 and 1951 was competent to devise and implement a career service program. From then until Mr. Reynolds became Assistant Director for Personnel, I feel that the Career Service Board and the Office

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

of Personnel had been at odds. I do not feel that we got the cooperation that was necessary for the implementation of any career service program in the Agency. With the coming of Mr. Reynolds as Assistant Director for Personnel, and the confidence that the Director and the Deputy Director placed in him, and that we all place in him, I think that we can no longer act at cross-purposes and accomplish anything if we are going to work at cross-purposes with the Office of Personnel. So I second both of your motions.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think the quickest way to reconcile this is: Is anyone opposed to those two motions?

25X1A9a

██████████ May I ask one question before we go forward? Does this mean that the idea of announcing this program around 1 July, or whatever the date set, has now been abandoned?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It means that anything planned from henceforth on is in the hands of the Office of Personnel.

MR. REYNOLDS: I will answer that by saying, "Yes - we are NOT ready for it and won't be ready for it on 1 July."

25X1A9a

██████████ I'd like to make a brief statement and that is that I think the main thing, in the relatively short time that I have been on this Board, that we have succeeded in accomplishing here is instilling into all ranks and levels of this Agency the idea that career service is important and that something has got to be done about it; and that it is the responsibility of everybody from the lowest supervisory level up to the top, to participate in this, and that it is not something that can be forced upon or imposed upon or layered over this Agency by a Personnel Office or anybody else - that it has to be a part of and built into this outfit, and built into the people who have to live with these personnel every day, and to whom they are not numbers on a card but are living, breathing, human beings who are walking up to your desk and saying, "How about this, chum?" So I do hope this rather precipitous and undignified manner of dissolving ourselves - I do hope that the system that comes out of it does not turn to former systems because those former systems have been unworkable - and that that business of building into the whole structure of this outfit will be maintained.

MR. WHITE: I am opposed to the motion until it incorporates into it my modification. I'd like to say this, that I don't know that it is at

~~SECRET~~

all proper for this Board to either accept Kirk's resignation or dissolve itself. After all, we weren't put here by popular vote - we were put here by the Director.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I assume in the motion that it be recommended to the Director that this be done.

MR. WHITE: That is why I think my motion is a much more appropriate motion than yours without my modification, because my motion doesn't disturb the equilibrium of this Board or dissolve this Board in any undignified fashion, but requires the two people with principal interest in this thing to go to the Director and discuss it. I think it is much more appropriate that that be done than that we pass a resolution here that Kirk resign and that the Board be dissolved. I'd like to ask that the Board give that some consideration, but first make sure that we know just what motion we are voting on.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I have a question on a point of order. It is my recollection that we approved the dissolution of this Board and the establishment of a new Board with a different Chairman, and with the Inspector General as a member, and the timing seems to be the only question that arises. We don't have to re-vote on what we have already approved.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] But we had a very specific contingency in there that the Board would be disbanded at the time this plan was announced. So the vote of the Board should be as to whether its former motion stands, in effect, or Mr. Reynold's motion is accepted.

MR. REYNOLDS: I haven't made any motion, I just made a proposal for consideration.

MR. WHITE: I'd like to urge that my motion be voted on

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I think part of it is out of order. I think you should rephrase your motion as to the first part to go to the Director to decide when we implement what we have already agreed upon.

MR. WHITE: I would be glad to adopt any suggestion.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would like to suggest a further amendment to that particular motion. I would like to suggest that the entire Board, rather than Mr. Reynolds and myself, discuss this with the Director at his convenience, and the Deputy Director.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I'll buy that.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Now who is the parliamentarian who sorts all of this out?



~~CONFIDENTIAL~~  
~~SECRET~~

MR. WHITE: Kirk, I'm not sure that is the best way to do it. I think you pioneered this program and you know what has gone into it, and Harry is going to have to implement it. I am seriously not sure that is the best way to sort this out.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, there is one issue we are all skirting around, which we might as well face up to, and that is that the Personnel Office is unhappy with the present program, doesn't think it can be implemented with the speed the Career Service Board wishes to implement it, and therefore we are not pulling on the same team with the same strength. Now that is the basic issue - why prolong it? Let's not look aside, let's get right at it.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] If the Personnel Office feels that way about it they have a good forum for discussing it right here. I represent one Deputy Director, and it is a lead pipe cinch that no program is going in with the nonconcurrence of all three. So I don't see what is the matter with this forum. If we aren't all pulling together why doesn't the Personnel Office revise the program and bring it before this Board?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I'd like to make a comment, because I am very concerned. I have served on many of these task forces. On every one the Office of Personnel has been represented. To my knowledge we have done our best to get agreement across the Board. Frankly, Mr. Reynolds, I have a fear we are going into another one-year delay in trying to implement these things we have hassled over. Any one of these problems can be opened up and then the main spring is going through the ceiling. And time is most important on our side of the house. Our people are waiting for SOMETHING, and I think we have to do it soon.

MR. REYNOLDS: I'll answer that by saying that I am fed up with those task forces and I think it is time to get it by command, and I think if this Board will recommend to the Director that certain things be done by command - but be damn sure that what we are proposing to him can be carried out legally. I'll do it any way you people want, because naturally I know, Dick, that anything that doesn't have the concurrence of the DD Offices - would be absurd and just wouldn't work. All I want to do is to try to get this thing on wheels as fast as possible, and my only contention for saying that I'd like the conversion made now is that we are in this business 100 percent of the time and we think we may be able to come up with

~~SECRET~~ ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

something - using this as a basic framework - which we can get through a little faster if it is all in our Office.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] But you have to bring it before a Board anyhow.

MR. REYNOLDS: It can be either passed to the major components, or, much better, my concept would be that this very group around this table would sit--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I don't see the two things happening together. One is dissolution of the Board and one is rewriting this career service paper.

25X1A9a MR. REYNOLDS: Well, upon dissolution of this Board another Board is automatically created - as [REDACTED] pointed out - we have done this.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] If you say "upon completion of THIS program" - is this the last one?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The insurance program.

MR. BAIRD: Well, General, the trouble is that we aren't nearer completion of the program because the AD for Personnel wants to extend it. The trouble with Red's motion is that we are merely prolonging a situation which is not new, and that if the AD for Personnel is going to have the responsibility for this, which I think he should, he wants it NOW. I think we are merely, in his eyes anyhow, impeding progress by not giving it to him now.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, I think in view of the time, and I know all of you want to get away, I would like to recommend that the Board accept, as of this moment, Colonel White's motion that Mr. Reynolds and the Chairman of the Board discuss with the Director the question of timing, which is the major issue involved, at the Director's earliest convenience.

MR. BAIRD: You are then withdrawing your motion?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Just a moment - I haven't finished. I intend, however, with no disrespect intended for the Board, to submit in writing to the Director tomorrow morning, my resignation as Chairman of the CIA Career Service Board with the reasons stated therefor.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] But you are taking that action as an individual?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I am taking that action as an individual. Is Colonel White's motion as I described it, acceptable? Any further discussion? Any new business? Stand adjourned.

. . . The Meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m. . . .